



K. Chad Burgess
Director & Deputy General Counsel

chad.burgess@scana.com

August 15, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

The Honorable Jocelyn G. Boyd
Chief Clerk/Administrator
Public Service Commission of South Carolina
101 Executive Center Drive
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

RE: Petition of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company for Prudency Determination Regarding Abandonment, Amendments to the Construction Schedule, Capital Cost Schedule and Other Terms of the BLRA Orders for the V.C. Summer Units 2 & 3 and Related Matters
Docket No. 2017-244-E

Dear Ms. Boyd:

On August 1, 2017, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company ("SCE&G" or "Company") filed a Petition for Prudency Determination Regarding Abandonment, Amendments to the Construction Schedule, Capital Cost Schedule and Other Terms of the BLRA Orders for V.C. Summer Units 2 & 3 and Related Matters ("Petition") in the above-referenced docket. This filing was made in light of the decision which SCE&G made on July 31, 2017, to abandon the construction of Units 2 and 3 at the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station in Jenkinsville, S.C. In the proceedings related to the Petition, SCE&G was prepared to present to the Commission and the public full and detailed information concerning that decision and the events that made it necessary.

Since that time, a number of public officials and legislative bodies have sought an opportunity to review the decisions leading to the abandonment of the new nuclear project. By motion dated August 9, 2017, the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff ("ORS") moved to dismiss the Petition citing, among other things, ORS's desire to "assist by providing time" for such review by the Governor, the V.C. Summer Nuclear Project Senate Review Committee, the Utility Ratepayer Protection House Committee, and the South Carolina Public Utilities Review Committee, among others.

(Continued . . .)

SCE&G acknowledges the interest in allowing these inquiries to proceed without the pressure of simultaneous adjudicatory proceedings before the Commission under S.C. Code Ann. § 58-33-270(E) and 58-23-280(K). Therefore, pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 58-3-225(E) (2015), SCE&G hereby voluntarily withdraws its Petition in this docket as matter of right without prejudice to file for similar relief in a future proceeding. Additionally, the Company reserves the right to file for accounting directives to address certain tax or accounting issues raised by these matters.¹

As a result of SCE&G withdrawing its Petition, it is no longer necessary for the Public Service Commission of South Carolina to take action on any pending matter before it in this docket as those matters are now moot.

By copy of this letter, we are informing the other parties of record, including those who have filed a Petition to Intervene which has not yet been ruled upon, of the Company's decision to withdraw its Petition.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,



K. Chad Burgess

KCB/kms

cc: Shannon Bowyer Hudson, Esquire
Jeffrey M. Nelson, Esquire
Robert Guild, Esquire
Frank R. Ellerbe, III, Esquire
John H. Tiencken, Jr., Esquire
Paul Conway, Esquire
Michael N. Couick, Esquire
Christopher R. Koon, Esquire
Robert E. Tyson, Jr., Esquire
Scott Elliott, Esquire
J. Blanding Holman, IV, Esquire
Frank Knapp, Jr.
Lynn Teague

(all via electronic mail and U.S. First Class Mail)

¹ By voluntarily withdrawing its Petition, SCE&G is not consenting to ORS's motion, and likewise, is not waiving, but is specifically reserving, its rights to respond to any motion that ORS may file in a future proceeding.